



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARCHEOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY.¹

The "Plateau Implements" of Southern England.—It is natural to suppose, whether we believe in the skeleton of Castenodolo, the scratched bones of Monte Aperto, and the worked flints of Thenay and Otta or not, that man did not of a sudden manufacture "Turtle-backs" of Chellean type, and that somewhere on the globe stones flaked more rudely than the rudest of these, tell of his childish handiwork.

The question as to the 2500 flint pebbles, nicked, nipped, notched, saw edged, and sharp ended, called "Plateau Implements" and collected by Mr. Benjamin Harrison near Itham in Kent, England, is whether they are or are not artificial.

The gravels from which they come have not been geologically dated by intermixed fossils, but the beds—if not Tertiary must be far older than the drift "turtle-back" bearing strata of the Darent vale below them. They spread for miles along a ridge-top 340 feet above the sea, with no place to wash from and cannot therefore be connected with the present river system of South England.

Where the surface loam has been weathered off them, the yellow patinated "implements" are found lying on the gravel, and it is asserted that the latter are in place and not dropped there like the white chipped celts of Neolithic men that sometimes lie with them.

Careful trenching is needed to demonstrate the true position of these strange stones, duplicates of which Mr. Worthington G. Smith says he has found in the later drift deposits along with "Turtle-backs" near Dunstable, in Bedfordshire. But Professor Prestwich one of the first recognizers of Boucher de Perthes' discovery in 1859, views Mr. Harrison's specimens which now awaken contention, as the handiwork of men living before the time of the drift.

Quaternary Gravel Specimens in Spain.—In October, 1892, the Baron de Baye visiting the Quaternary gravel exposures at San Isidro on the right bank of the Mazanares opposite Madrid, bought from a workman two "Turtle-backs" (if we may here use the inoffensive word) one of quartzite and one of flint, of the type called Chellean by M. Gabriel de Mortillet (more or less leaf shaped and chipped on both sides) also one other specimen of flint of the pattern called Mousterian by de Mortillet (ie, chipped only on one side.)

¹ This department is edited by Mr. H. C. Mercer, University of Pennsylvania.

The workman told M. de Baye that he had found the Chellean and Mousterian specimens close together in the same top layer, and the latter repeated the statement before the meeting of the Société de Anthropologie at Paris on July 15, 1893, reading also a letter from M. Siret the geologist who said he had discovered in the summer of 1892, 30 Chellean, 1 Solutrian (broad thin well worked leaf shaped blade) and 6 Mousterian specimens in the self same upper stratum.

Two Mousterian objects of this list were shown but how many of the 37 were found with M. Sirets' own hands in place does not appear.

If these stone Implement types running through the drift deposits and cave layers of France. (a) Chellean (River Drift), (b) Mousterian (cave period of chipping flakes on one side only) (c) Solutrian (cave period of finest blade chipping) and (d) Magdalenian (cave period of bone implements and animal sketching) represent cultural epochs in Mans' evolution as is claimed by M. de Mortillet, then these Spanish specimens should have been found in separate layers, or at intervals, and not all close together at about 6 to 15 feet from the surface.

M. de Mortillet objected at the meeting that hearsay did not prove the alleged mingling. He said that the two Chellean "Turtle-backs" shown were not typical and believed that if the case were reconsidered a sequence of the types would be found in the different layers at San Isidro, as in France.

It was unfortunate that M. Siret was not there to explain his startling assertion that everything was unclassifiably jumbled together in the upper layer. But to find the Chellean at the top, was what I afterward did when I pulled out a leaf shaped "turtle-back" of flint² from the perpendicular bank of the Carreña Sacerdotal at a depth of 1.80 metres from the surface, on Dec. 31, 1892.—H. C. MERCER.

The non-existence of Paleolithic Culture.—Mr. J. D. McGuire in the *American Anthropologist* for July, 1893, denies the existence of a time when Man chipped but could not polish stone. Assailing not the antiquity of human remains but their cultural significance, and backed by his valuable and unique experience in the carving, polishing and boring processes of the stone age, he attacks Sir John Lubbocks celebrated definition as follows.

(1) Battering and grinding is easier than chipping and so must have preceeded it.

(2) Paleolithic Men made pottery for it is found in the Paleolithic

² Now in the Archæological Museum of the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia.

caves of Spy in Belgium (under Mousterian), Trou Magrite Belgium (with Mammoth and Rhinoceros), Nabrigas, France (with cave Bear), and Engis Belgium (with Rhinoceros).

(3) Paleolithic cave men bored and carved bone, and used pitted stone hammers at Les Eyzies, La Madeleine, Gorge D'Enfer and Laugerie Basse and therefore should have been able to polish stone.

(4) The absence of Drift specimens in Neolithic graves means that Drift "implements" in Europe are like American quarry "Turtle-backs" not implements at all and so not placed by the Neolithic men who made them, with their dead.

(5) Polished stone implements through made by Drift Men are absent from the Drift because the Drift beds were like American quarries where the stone chipper left no village relics.

(6) The Drift Mans' pottery is not in the Drift because even if lost there gravel washing would destroy it.

We follow these arguments with great interest but think (1) that while Indian blade making of the Quarry time was a complex difficult art, chip knife or "Teshoa" making at one blow, or "Turtle-back" making at 20 blows (if "Turtle-back" is all we want) is easier than hand hammering and grinding. (2) The 2nd argument warrants a review of the cave records, for if Paleolithic cave men did make pottery then the French classification collapses, and the Museums and Handbooks of Europe which it seems have failed to bring out the fact, are not to be trusted. (3) Why men who bored polished and carved bone, sketched realistic animal designs, and chipped blades equal in make to Mexican sacrificial knives did not polish stone seems incomprehensible. But the European Museums clearly assert that no polished stone tool has been found in the caves. If true, the fact is conclusive against Mr. McGuire. The finding of pitted hammerstones in Paleolithic caves involves a tendency to carving in the indentations themselves, but some of these hammers might have been corn and not stone bruisers after all, just as some such (Brough Smith's *Aborigines of Victoria* p. 385) were used by Australian native divers for clapping under water to scare fish into nets as well as to pound roots.

As to argument (4), the most striking European Drift form, the blunt based "Coup de Poing" is not like the turtle-backs in the American quarries examined. By no quarry turtle-back analysis can it be called an unfinished implement and so unadapted for deposit in graves.

If Neolithic Men made Coups de Poing as Indians made turtle-backs we should only have to go to a Neolithic Quarry to find them, but Spiennes, fairly considered, contains none.

To argument (5) it may be said that European Drift deposits are really analogous to our Riverside workshops where Indian relics are plenty, and not to quarries; while if we do compare them to quarries Indian relics have been found in my knowledge, at four. Realizing this we see no reason why polished implements should not be found in the Drift if the Drift Men made them. The 6th argument as to the destruction of pottery in washing gravel seems conclusive against expecting to find it there.

Thanks are due to Mr. McGuire for his exceedingly interesting and suggestive paper which should suffice to induce revision of the European Cave classification in which as it suggests there may be serious flaws.